



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,834	03/31/2004	Keiichiro Tounai	NEC A433	6044
27667	7590	02/22/2010	EXAMINER	
HAYES SOLOWAY P.C. 3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140 TUCSON, AZ 85718			PARK, EDWARD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

admin@hayes-soloway.com
smckniff@hayes-soloway.com
nsoloway@hayes-soloway.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/813,834	TOUNAI, KEIICHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	EDWARD PARK	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment and remarks received on 11/30/09.
Claims 1-26 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/30/09, in regards to claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21-26, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Tounai does not disclose testing a mask pattern (see pg. 4, last paragraph – pg. 5, first paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since Tounai discloses the cited limitation within col. 2, lines 24-34, fig. 4, col. 3, lines 39-50; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacturing a semiconductor device including the steps of: designating a first region specified by a first mask pattern of a first level mask; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step. Examiner notes that it is clear that a mask pattern is tested within Tounai as stated above, since the reference teaches designating a mask pattern by different criteria in order to compare it with another pattern to produce a corrected mask pattern. Furthermore, examiner notes that a test pattern can be interpreted as a test region or area.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17, applicant argues that the claims are allowable due to the dependencies from the respective independent claims (see pg. 5, second paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the independent claims are rejected and the arguments and rejections can be seen within this action.

Regarding claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, applicant argues that the claims are allowable due to the dependencies from the respective independent claims (see pg. 5, last paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since the independent claims are rejected and the arguments and rejections can be seen within this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. In response to claims 1-7, 15-22, 25, 26, applicant argues that the claims meet the requirements for 35 USC 101 Tied-to-Criteria since the claim as a whole is tied to a particular apparatus, a mask (see pg. 3, last paragraph – pg. 4, second paragraph). This argument is not considered persuasive since a mask is not a particular machine that performs the steps as indicated by the corresponding independent claims. Rather, the mask is the object being manipulated as seen within the limitations of the claims. It would not be proper for the mask to operate on itself to achieve the steps as seen within the claim language. The examiner notes that the steps of applying, dividing, determining, etc. can be operated by a non-machine; a person can manually perform the steps as cited within the independent claims to achieve the process as a whole. Particularly, a person can perform the steps of applying optical proximity-effect compensation to a first pattern to be tested .. to thereby actually form a mask pattern of said mask layer. Examiner notes that the applicant can easily overcome the 101 rejection by inserting, “a

processor performing the steps of:” within the beginning of the body of the claim. Furthermore, a processor or computing device needs to be supported within the specification to avoid 112 new matter or enablement issues.

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7, 15-20, 21, 22, 25, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. The Federal Circuit¹, relying upon Supreme Court precedent², has indicated that a statutory “process” under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) transform a particular article to a different state or thing. This is referred to as the “machine or transformation test”, whereby the recitation of a particular machine or transformation of an article must impose meaningful limits on the claim's scope to impart patent-eligibility (See *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71-72), and the involvement of the machine or transformation in the claimed process must not merely be insignificant extra-solution activity (See *Flook*, 437 U.S. at 590”). While the instant claim(s) recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, the claim(s) neither transform an article nor are positively tied to a particular machine that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. That is, the method includes steps of applying, dividing, determining, simulating, checking, etc. is of sufficient breadth that it would be reasonably interpreted as a series of steps completely performed mentally, verbally, or without a machine. The cited claims do not positively recite

¹ *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

² *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

any structure within the body of the claim which ties the claim to a statutory category. Furthermore, the examiner suggests that the structure needs to tie in the basic inventive concept of the application to a statutory category. Structure that ties insignificant pre or post solution activity to a statutory category is not sufficient in overcoming the 101 issue. Additionally, the limitations do not claim data that represents a physical object or substance, the data representing the physical object is not present and therefore can not be modified by the process in a meaningful or significant manner, and no meaningful and significant external, non-data depiction of a physical object or substance is produced. Thus, the limitations do not satisfy the transformation test.

¹ *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

² *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 21-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tounai (US 6,174,633 B1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Tounai discloses a method of testing a mask pattern, comprising the steps of:

applying optical proximity-effect compensation to a first pattern to be tested and to be formed onto a mask layer, to thereby actually form a mask pattern of said mask layer (see col. 2, lines 24-34; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacturing a semiconductor device including the steps of: designating a first region specified by a first mask pattern of a first level mask);

dividing said first pattern into a plurality of areas in accordance with a second pattern to be formed onto another mask layer (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 30-40; interconnect 11 in a first level mask which is an interconnect layer pattern or its component, and a plug 12 in a second level mask which is a plug layer pattern or its component. In a first step, regions 15 and 16 separated from specified linear sides 13 and 14 parallel to each other by a distance "c", respectively, are formed by the computer 66);

determining sampling points on an edge of said first pattern (see fig. 4, see col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 locates a first and a second corners 17 and 18 of the interconnect 11 contained in the regions 15 and 16, respectively, in a second step. The computer 66 regards a side formed between the first corner 17 and the second corner 18 as a terminal node of the interconnect 11 in a third step. The side is referred to as a standard side 19. The computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24);

determining a test standard for each of said areas (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step); simulating a resist pattern formed on a resist by exposing said resist to a light through said mask pattern (see col. 2, lines 13-18, 34-40; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacture of a semiconductor device); and

checking whether a dimensional gap between said first pattern and said resist pattern at each of said sampling points is within a test standard associated with an area to which each of said sampling points belongs (see col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step), wherein a test standard for a first area among said areas and a test standard for a second area among said areas are different from each other (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 30-50; regions 15 and 16 separated from specified linear sides 13 and 14 parallel to each other by a distance "c", respectively, are formed by the computer 66; regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19).

Regarding **claim 4**, Tounai discloses pattern for forming a wiring layer, said second pattern is a pattern for forming a contact reaching said wiring layer, and said first area includes a third area including a contact area in which said contact makes contact with said wiring layer (see fig. 5, col. 4, lines 13-55).

Regarding **claim 5**, Tounai discloses a contact area and an ambient area surrounding said contact area (see fig. 5, col. 4, lines 13-55).

Regarding **claim 8**, Tounai discloses a computer-readable medium storing a program for causing a computer to carry out a method of testing a mask pattern (see fig. 3, lines 30-50), wherein said method is executed by said computer in accordance with said program including the steps of:

applying optical proximity-effect compensation to a first pattern to be tested and to be formed onto a mask layer, to thereby actually form a mask pattern of said mask layer (see col. 2, lines 24-34; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacturing a semiconductor device including the steps of: designating a first region specified by a first mask pattern of a first level mask);

dividing said first pattern into a plurality of areas in accordance with a second pattern to be formed onto another mask layer (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 30-40; interconnect 11 in a first level mask which is an interconnect layer pattern or its component, and a plug 12 in a second level mask which is a plug layer pattern or its component. In a first step, regions 15 and 16 separated from specified linear sides 13 and 14 parallel to each other by a distance "c", respectively, are formed by the computer 66);

determining sampling points on an edge of said first pattern (see fig. 4, see col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 locates a first and a second corners 17 and 18 of the interconnect 11 contained in the regions 15 and 16, respectively, in a second step. The computer 66 regards a side formed between the first corner 17 and the second corner 18 as a terminal node of the interconnect 11 in a third step. The side is referred to as a standard side 19. The computer 66

establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24);

determining a test standard for each of said areas (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step);

simulating a resist pattern formed on a resist by exposing said resist to a light through said mask pattern (see col. 2, lines 13-18, 34-40; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacture of a semiconductor device); and checking whether a dimensional gap between said first pattern and said resist pattern at each of said sampling points is within a test standard associated with an area to which each of said sampling points belongs (see col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step), wherein a test standard for a first area among said areas and a test standard for a second area among said areas are different from each other (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 30-50; regions 15 and 16 separated from specified linear sides 13 and 14 parallel to each other by a distance "c", respectively, are formed by the computer 66; regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19).

Regarding **claim 11**, Tounai discloses pattern for forming a wiring layer, said second pattern is a pattern for forming a contact reaching said wiring layer, and said first area includes a

third area including a contact area in which said contact makes contact with said wiring layer (see fig. 5, col. 4, lines 13-55).

Regarding **claim 12**, Tounai discloses a contact area and an ambient area surrounding said contact area (see fig. 5, col. 4, lines 13-55).

Regarding **claim 15**, Garza discloses a method of forming a mask having a desired mask pattern including the steps of:

applying optical proximity-effect compensation to a first pattern to be tested and to be formed onto a mask layer, to thereby actually form a mask pattern of said mask layer (see col. 2, lines 24-34; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacturing a semiconductor device including the steps of: designating a first region specified by a first mask pattern of a first level mask);

dividing said first pattern into a plurality of areas in accordance with a second pattern to be formed onto another mask layer (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 30-40; interconnect 11 in a first level mask which is an interconnect layer pattern or its component, and a plug 12 in a second level mask which is a plug layer pattern or its component. In a first step, regions 15 and 16 separated from specified linear sides 13 and 14 parallel to each other by a distance "c", respectively, are formed by the computer 66);

determining sampling points on an edge of said first pattern (see fig. 4, see col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 locates a first and a second corners 17 and 18 of the interconnect 11 contained in the regions 15 and 16, respectively, in a second step. The computer 66 regards a side formed between the first corner 17 and the second corner 18 as a terminal node of the interconnect 11 in a third step. The side is referred to as a standard side 19. The computer 66

establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24);

determining a test standard for each of said areas (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step);

simulating a resist pattern formed on a resist by exposing said resist to a light through said mask pattern (see col. 2, lines 13-18, 34-40; correcting a photo-contiguous effect during manufacture of a semiconductor device);

checking whether a dimensional gap between said first pattern and said resist pattern at each of said sampling points is within a test standard associated with an area to which each of said sampling points belongs(see col. 3, lines 39-50; computer 66 establishes in the first level mask a corrected mask pattern having a first and a second additional regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19 and one of the two adjacent sides 21 and 22 in a fourth step); and

transferring said mask pattern onto a mask (see col. 3, lines 30-67, col. 4, lines 1-13), wherein a test standard for a first area among said areas and a test standard for a second area among said areas are different from each other (see fig. 4, col. 3, lines 30-50; regions 15 and 16 separated from specified linear sides 13 and 14 parallel to each other by a distance "c", respectively, are formed by the computer 66; regions 23 and 24 having projections "a" and lengths "b" in contact with the standard side 19).

Regarding **claim 18**, Tounai discloses pattern for forming a wiring layer, said second pattern is a pattern for forming a contact reaching said wiring layer, and said first area includes a third area including a contact area in which said contact makes contact with said wiring layer (see fig. 5, col. 4, lines 13-55).

Regarding **claim 19**, Tounai discloses a contact area and an ambient area surrounding said contact area (see fig. 5, col. 4, lines 13-55).

Regarding **claim 21**, Tounai discloses a gate layer, and a number of sampling points in an area acting as a gate of a transistor is higher than the same in other areas (see col. 3, lines 30-63).

Regarding **claim 22**, Tounai discloses a gate layer, and a number of sampling points in a contact area is higher than the same in other areas (see col. 3, lines 30-63).

Regarding **claim 23**, Tounai discloses a gate layer, and a number of sampling points in an area acting as a gate of a transistor is higher than the same in other areas (see col. 3, lines 30-63).

Regarding **claim 24**, Tounai discloses a gate layer, and a number of sampling points in a contact area is higher than the same in other areas (see col. 3, lines 30-63).

Regarding **claim 25**, Tounai discloses a gate layer, and a number of sampling points in an area acting as a gate of a transistor is higher than the same in other areas (see col. 3, lines 30-63).

Regarding **claim 26**, Tounai discloses a gate layer, and a number of sampling points in a contact area is higher than the same in other areas (see col. 3, lines 30-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 2, 3, 9, 10, 16, 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tounai (US 6,174,633 B1) in view of Tsudaka (US 5,991,006).

Regarding **claims 2, 3**, Tounai discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 1. Tounai does not teach N-th sampling points located in a N-th area, among said sampling points, is determined in accordance with a N-th process in said step (c) where N indicates an integer equal to or greater than one ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$), and first to N-th processes are different from one another; and dividing an edge of said first pattern into a plurality of portions, wherein said test standard is determined for each of said portions.

Tsudaka, in the same field of endeavor, teaches N-th sampling points located in a N-th area, among said sampling points, is determined in accordance with a N-th process in said step (c) where N indicates an integer equal to or greater than one ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$), and first to N-th processes are different from one another (see col. 2, lines 34-67; col. 3, lines 1-15; transferred image as being closest possible to the desired design pattern in the lithography process. More specifically, the method comprises the steps of dividing the visible outline of the desired design pattern into edges according to a specified rule, then assigning a plurality of evaluation points to each of the edges; computing a transferred pattern image after the exposure by simulation;

computing a distance between each evaluation point or each edge and a position corresponding to each evaluation point of the transferred image of the exposed pattern; and determining a corrected exposure pattern by inputting the distance to a specified evaluation function to correct the position of each edge according to an output value of the evaluation function. The above method of the present invention further includes the steps of dividing the visible outline of the desired design pattern into edges according to a specified rule, then assigning a plurality of evaluation points to each of the edges; computing a transferred energy intensity of the exposed pattern by simulation; determining a corrected exposure pattern by inputting the transferred energy intensity to a specified evaluation function to correct the position of each edge according to the output value of the evaluation function; plurality of evaluation points are assigned to each of the edges obtained by dividing the visible outline of the object design pattern and computing the distance between each evaluation point and the position corresponding to each evaluation point on the exposed pattern image, and the distance between each of a plurality of the evaluation points and the exposure image on each edge can be computed); and dividing an edge of said first pattern into a plurality of portions, wherein said test standard is determined for each of said portions (see col. 2, lines 34-67; col. 3, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tounai to utilize multiple sampling points and standards as suggested by Tsudaka, in order to optimize a mask pattern for simulation and production by reducing time and processes in the correction of these irregular patterns (see col. 1, lines 20-48).

Regarding **claims 9, 10**, Tounai discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 8. Tounai does not teach N-th sampling points located in a N-th area, among said sampling points,

is determined in accordance with a N-th process in said step (c) where N indicates an integer equal to or greater than one ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$), and first to N-th processes are different from one another; and dividing an edge of said first pattern into a plurality of portions, wherein said test standard is determined for each of said portions.

Tsudaka, in the same field of endeavor, teaches N-th sampling points located in a N-th area, among said sampling points, is determined in accordance with a N-th process in said step (c) where N indicates an integer equal to or greater than one ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$), and first to N-th processes are different from one another (see col. 2, lines 34-67; col. 3, lines 1-15; transferred image as being closest possible to the desired design pattern in the lithography process. More specifically, the method comprises the steps of dividing the visible outline of the desired design pattern into edges according to a specified rule, then assigning a plurality of evaluation points to each of the edges; computing a transferred pattern image after the exposure by simulation; computing a distance between each evaluation point or each edge and a position corresponding to each evaluation point of the transferred image of the exposed pattern; and determining a corrected exposure pattern by inputting the distance to a specified evaluation function to correct the position of each edge according to an output value of the evaluation function. The above method of the present invention further includes the steps of dividing the visible outline of the desired design pattern into edges according to a specified rule, then assigning a plurality of evaluation points to each of the edges; computing a transferred energy intensity of the exposed pattern by simulation; determining a corrected exposure pattern by inputting the transferred energy intensity to a specified evaluation function to correct the position of each edge according to the output value of the evaluation function; plurality of a evaluation points are assigned to

each of the edges obtained by dividing the visible outline of the object design pattern and computing the distance between each evaluation point and the position corresponding to each evaluation point on the exposed pattern image, and the distance between each of a plurality of the evaluation points and the exposure image on each edge can be computed); and dividing an edge of said first pattern into a plurality of portions, wherein said test standard is determined for each of said portions (see col. 2, lines 34-67; col. 3, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tounai to utilize multiple sampling points and standards as suggested by Tsudaka, in order to optimize a mask pattern for simulation and production by reducing time and processes in the correction of these irregular patterns (see col. 1, lines 20-48).

Regarding **claims 16, 17**, Tounai discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 15. Tounai does not teach N-th sampling points located in a N-th area, among said sampling points, is determined in accordance with a N-th process in said step (c) where N indicates an integer equal to or greater than one ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$), and first to N-th processes are different from one another; and dividing an edge of said first pattern into a plurality of portions, wherein said test standard is determined for each of said portions.

Tsudaka, in the same field of endeavor, teaches N-th sampling points located in a N-th area, among said sampling points, is determined in accordance with a N-th process in said step (c) where N indicates an integer equal to or greater than one ($N = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$), and first to N-th processes are different from one another (see col. 2, lines 34-67; col. 3, lines 1-15; transferred image as being closest possible to the desired design pattern in the lithography process. More specifically, the method comprises the steps of dividing the visible outline of the desired design

pattern into edges according to a specified rule, then assigning a plurality of evaluation points to each of the edges; computing a transferred pattern image after the exposure by simulation; computing a distance between each evaluation point or each edge and a position corresponding to each evaluation point of the transferred image of the exposed pattern; and determining a corrected exposure pattern by inputting the distance to a specified evaluation function to correct the position of each edge according to an output value of the evaluation function. The above method of the present invention further includes the steps of dividing the visible outline of the desired design pattern into edges according to a specified rule, then assigning a plurality of evaluation points to each of the edges; computing a transferred energy intensity of the exposed pattern by simulation; determining a corrected exposure pattern by inputting the transferred energy intensity to a specified evaluation function to correct the position of each edge according to the output value of the evaluation function; plurality of a evaluation points are assigned to each of the edges obtained by dividing the visible outline of the object design pattern and computing the distance between each evaluation point and the position corresponding to each evaluation point on the exposed pattern image, and the distance between each of a plurality of the evaluation points and the exposure image on each edge can be computed); and dividing an edge of said first pattern into a plurality of portions, wherein said test standard is determined for each of said portions (see col. 2, lines 34-67; col. 3, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tounai to utilize multiple sampling points and standards as suggested by Tsudaka, in order to optimize a mask pattern for simulation and production by reducing time and processes in the correction of these irregular patterns (see col. 1, lines 20-48).

9. **Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tounai (US 6,174,633 B1) in view of Miyazaki (US 6,665,858 B2).

Regarding **claims 6, 7**, Tounai discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 1. Tounai does not teach pattern for forming a wiring layer including a gate of a MOS transistor, said second pattern is a pattern for forming an active area of said MOS transistor, and said first area includes a fourth area including a fifth area obtained by projecting said active area onto said first pattern; and fifth area and an ambient area surrounding said fifth area.

Miyazaki, in the same field of endeavor, teaches pattern for forming a wiring layer including a gate of a MOS transistor, said second pattern is a pattern for forming an active area of said MOS transistor, and said first area includes a fourth area including a fifth area obtained by projecting said active area onto said first pattern (see col. 2, lines 1-17, col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-21); and fifth area and an ambient area surrounding said fifth area (see col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-21).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tounai to utilize a wiring layer and multiple areas as suggested by Miyazaki, in order to ensure that the simulation and production of layers/patterns are accurately in compliance with design data (see col. 1, lines 53-63).

Regarding **claims 13, 14**, Tounai discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 8. Tounai does not teach pattern for forming a wiring layer including a gate of a MOS transistor, said second pattern is a pattern for forming an active area of said MOS transistor, and said first area includes a fourth area including a fifth area obtained by projecting said active area onto said first pattern; and fifth area and an ambient area surrounding said fifth area.

Miyazaki, in the same field of endeavor, teaches pattern for forming a wiring layer including a gate of a MOS transistor, said second pattern is a pattern for forming an active area of said MOS transistor, and said first area includes a fourth area including a fifth area obtained by projecting said active area onto said first pattern (see col. 2, lines 1-17, col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-21); and fifth area and an ambient area surrounding said fifth area (see col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-21).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tounai to utilize a wiring layer and multiple areas as suggested by Miyazaki, in order to ensure that the simulation and production of layers/patterns are accurately in compliance with design data (see col. 1, lines 53-63).

Regarding **claim 20**, Tounai discloses all elements as mentioned above in claim 15. Tounai does not teach pattern for forming a wiring layer including a gate of a MOS transistor, said second pattern is a pattern for forming an active area of said MOS transistor, and said first area includes a fourth area including a fifth area obtained by projecting said active area onto said first pattern.

Miyazaki, in the same field of endeavor, teaches pattern for forming a wiring layer including a gate of a MOS transistor, said second pattern is a pattern for forming an active area of said MOS transistor, and said first area includes a fourth area including a fifth area obtained by projecting said active area onto said first pattern (see col. 2, lines 1-17, col. 6, lines 64-67, col. 7, lines 1-21).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Tounai to utilize a wiring layer and multiple areas as suggested by

Miyazaki, in order to ensure that the simulation and production of layers/patterns are accurately in compliance with design data (see col. 1, lines 53-63).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWARD PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1576. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30 - 20:00, (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samir Ahmed can be reached on (571) 272-7413. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edward Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

/Edward Park/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Brian Q Le/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2624